

## **REMARKS**

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.111, reconsideration of the instant application, as amended herewith, is respectfully requested. Entry of the amendment is requested.

Claims 1-5 are presently pending before the Office. No claims have been canceled. Applicant has amended the claims. No new matter has been added. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the specification as originally filed. Applicant is not intending in any manner to narrow the scope of the originally filed claims.

The Examiner's Action mailed September 30, 2008 and the references cited therein have been carefully studied by Applicant and the undersigned counsel. The amendments appearing herein and these explanatory remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the Action. Accordingly, this important patent application is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Relying on 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the Examiner has rejected the subject matter of claims 1-5 as obvious over Kawashima or Inoue (not Chou). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and requests reconsideration.

It is evident that Applicant's invention is decidedly different from the teachings of the patent. Although there are similar teachings in the cited references related to the claimed features in claims 1-5, applicant submits that there are distinctive features that does not render the claims unpatentable.

In particular, the present invention is distinctive in respect of the transmission characteristics of the piezoelectric transformers, as has been disclosed in the second paragraph of page 8 of the specification. Specifically, the last three lines of the paragraph indicate that "(t)he transmission characteristic shows that there is only one resonance point, that is,  $f_0$  even if there

is a variation between the respective piezoelectric transformers”, whereas the cited references do not disclose this feature.

Further, referring to Fig. 1 of Inoue at a glance may appear to show a pair of piezoelectric transformers 1 and 2 being connected in series on the primary sides, while connected through a load on the secondary sides. However, in fact, Fig. 1 of Inoue shows that the piezoelectric transformers are connected in parallel on the input side, distinctively from the series connection in the present invention. Inoue discloses in this respect that “a pair of piezoelectric transformers 1 and 2 .... are electrically connected in parallel with their driving portions polarized in the same direction relative to the electric driving voltage” (col. 2, lines 26-30). In the present invention, the piezoelectric transformer 1 and the piezoelectric transformer 2 are connected in series to the AC power supply E” (page 7, lines 12-13).

Accordingly, applicants submit that a prima facie case of obviousness has not been made.

### CONCLUSION

Even though the initial claims in this important patent application were drawn to a new, useful and nonobvious invention, they have now been amended to increase their specificity of language and to more clearly define the invention over the prior art. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-5, as amended herein, are patentable over the art of record.

A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

If the Office is not fully persuaded as to the merits of Applicant's position, or if an Examiner's Amendment would place the pending claims in condition for allowance, a telephone call to the undersigned at (727) 943-9300 would be appreciated.

Very respectfully,

February 20, 2009  
Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

/ Dennis G. LaPointe /

---

Dennis G. LaPointe  
LaPointe Law Group, P.L.  
P.O. Box 1294  
Tarpon Springs, FL 34688  
(727) 943-9300  
Reg. No. 40,693

## **AMENDMENT TO CLAIMS**

**[Deleted material is struck-through and added material is underlined]**